

**Oroville Facilities Relicensing Program  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission Project No. 2100  
Draft Summary of Cultural Resources Work Group Meeting  
November 16, 2005**

The Department of Water Resources (DWR) hosted the Cultural Resources Work Group (CRWG) meeting on November 16, 2005 in Oroville.

A summary of the discussion, decisions made, and action items is provided below. This summary is not intended to be a transcript, analysis of the meeting, or to indicate agreement or disagreement with any of the items summarized, except where expressly stated. The intent is to present a summary for interested parties who could not attend the meeting. The following are attachments to this summary.

Attachment 1	Meeting Agenda
Attachment 2	Meeting Attendees

### **Introduction**

Attendees were welcomed to the CRWG meeting and objectives were discussed. The meeting agenda and a list of meeting attendees and their affiliations are appended to this summary as Attachments 1 and 2, respectively.

### **Maidu Advisory Council Update**

Janis Offermann representing DWR gave an update on the most recent meeting of the Maidu Advisory Council (MAC). She informed the group that the Historic Properties Management Plan (HPMP) and prehistoric site evaluations were the primary topics of discussion. Another MAC meeting is scheduled for January 2006.

### **Update on Ethnographic Evaluation**

Helen McCarthy with Far Western told meeting attendees that questions have been developed for evaluation purposes and interviews with elders conducted. She said that Lawana Watson of the Enterprise Rancheria assisted in the ethnobotanic fieldwork that was conducted. In response to a question about how the evaluation of these resources is being conducted, Helen explained that they are looking at complexes of sites, which will likely be translated into several large districts with contributing and non-contributing elements. She also stated that work on the evaluations and evaluation report is continuing.

Eric Ritter, from the Bureau of Land Management (BLM), asked how the ethnographic work would be collated with the archaeological record. Helen answered that they are taking it on a case-by-case basis, describing the challenge of matching names to sites. She said some of the sites match up with named places and some do not. They have uncovered over 40 named villages, where only a few have been found archaeologically. Helen added that 144 places have been identified in the inventory, and that the places provide context and show how important an area was.

Rick Wilson asked about the normal radius of hunting areas for prehistoric peoples. The CRWG discussed the need for travel and the difference between travels associated with normal cultural activities and relocation or permanent migrations of people. Helen noted there is evidence that suggests people moved back and forth. She said discussions with elders revealed they traveled to different areas for ceremonies and to roundhouses on weekends. Some people also married into neighboring groups, or they picked plants that grew in certain areas. Some sites appear to be of seasonal use, while archival evidence indicates permanent occupancy for others.

The group briefly discussed the area known as Enterprise 1. Helen explained that Enterprise 1 is outside the project area so there has been little research on it for purposes of relicensing the Oroville Facilities. The CRWG also briefly discussed Maidu involvement in the relicensing efforts and acknowledged that this meeting is not a negotiation session, but rather a work group session devoted to reporting on studies developed and implemented over the last four years.

Eric Ritter described early ethnographic studies in the area and mentioned several flat and terraces that were expected to show evidence of use; however after visiting them, they found no archaeological evidence on the surface. Helen responded that for various reasons, matches with the archaeological record are not always found. She added that locations identified in the ethnographic research outside of the Area of Potential Effects (APE) but have importance to the locale will be included in an Appendix to the final report.

### **Evaluation Reports for Historic Sites**

Mark Selverston of Sonoma State University (SSU) gave an overview of the Archaeological and Historic Resources Inventory Report. He described the appendices that include the APE, areas inventoried, results of the inventory, and management tools. He also reviewed tables listing sites and isolates. Mark told the group that site records are in a separate appendix and available on 11 CD ROMs and as hardcopy at SSU, California State University, Chico (CSUC) and the Office of Historic Preservation. PDF files of site maps were produced on CD ROMs and will be available on a limited basis in accordance with confidentiality requirements.

Mark said that 78 new sites had been discovered during the evaluation phase of work. He went on to say that the evaluation of the McCabe Creek site (a 100-acre placer mining site) was completed in October and the McCabe Creek report is currently under review by DWR. Approximately 50 separate technical reports are currently in progress, as well as development of an image bank that will house all the photos taken during the field effort. The photos will be useful for DWR and Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) land managers for future decision-making. They will also have geospatial data on the photo CDs. Arlene Ward of the Mechoopda Indian Tribe of the Chico Rancheria asked if geospatial data would be broadly distributed. Janis Offermann said that some of it (non-confidential information) might get distributed to the public, but it has not yet been determined specifically how or what data would be made available.

Eric Ritter requested that information documented on the 78 newly-discovered sites be conveyed to BLM, if any of those sites are on BLM-managed lands. Mark Selverston did not believe any of the sites were on BLM lands, but said that he would look into this.

The CRWG discussed a map prepared prior to Oroville Facilities development that included Native American place names and that would be useful as a resource. It was unclear whether DWR had access to the map in question but Eric Ritter, who is familiar with the map, will investigate further.

### **Update on Prehistoric Fieldwork**

Michael Delacorte of California State University, Sacramento (CSUS) provided an update on prehistoric fieldwork efforts and indicated on an overhead the 10 sites above 825 feet that were expected to be accessible for fieldwork this year. He told the group that the field crew has completed four 5-day rotations and will start work again on January 10, 2006. In response to a question from Eric Ritter about the site classifications (Types 1 to 6), Michael explained that through the evaluation field work, several sites appeared to be more complex than originally indicated during the surface inventory. He then explained the testing process conducted at

each site. First, the sites were walked and artifacts flagged. Following limited surface collection, a series of 1.0 meter x 0.5 meter-units were excavated.

Michael described the types of artifacts uncovered and said some of the excavations yielded large amounts of charred plant remains but virtually no preserved bones. Michael told the group that they hope to be able to fill in the paleobotanical record using the plant remains found. At one location, the field crew found milling stone and ground stone, but almost no flaked stone. Eric Ritter asked if they are finding many projectile points. Michael said they are finding them on the surface of sites and subsurface in excavations although some of the sites have been looted. Eric also asked how many sites would be examined. Michael responded that the plan is to eventually revisit approximately 40 sites in the fluctuation zone, provided the reservoir water surface level drops to the level necessary to allow work at the locations. Eric also asked about information available from obsidian analysis. Michael noted that the sample from McCabe Creek indicated obsidian was coming from widely variable sources and that additional analysis was underway.

Annette DeBrotherton mentioned she had seen the CA-BUT-84 collection at CSUS, noted how impressive this collection was, and expressed a desire to put some of the excavated materials on display for long-term interaction with the public at some type of curation facility, possibly located on the CSUC campus or some other location. She suggested training local tribal members to act as curators and asked about the possibility of a consortium of interested parties to select a site for such a facility. Arlene Ward explained that a curation facility is already included in the settlement agreement being negotiated with DWR and that Native Americans have been actively engaged in those negotiations. Janis Offermann added that a curation facility is also in DWR's license application and it is something that DWR is committed to do.

Eric Ritter asked about studies of existing archaeological collections and the CRWG discussed CA-BUT-157. Michael Delacorte explained that the researchers decided to start with the larger collections such as CA-BUT-84 and then move on to the others, but they expect to eventually revisit all of the original collections.

### **Revised Historic Properties Management Plan (HPMP)**

Janis Offermann distributed copies of the revised HPMP to those who had not yet received a copy. She said there had not been many changes from the first HPMP. She explained that additions included Section 4.6 on traditional plant gathering areas and Appendix D, a list of actions exempt from additional cultural resources review. Actions such as facilities maintenance, power operations, replacement and reconstruction of small structures are included in the list. Janis told the group that FERC has requested a specific management proposal for McCabe Creek be included in the HPMP. She indicated the final draft of the HPMP, containing a preliminary management plan for McCabe Creek, will be available for review in January 2006. She suggested the CRWG next meet in January to discuss the final HPMP.

### **Next Meeting and Next Steps**

Janis announced the next CRWG meeting is tentatively scheduled for January 25, 2006.

### **Action Items**

None